





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/460,197		12/13/1999	JOHN SPENCER CUNNINGHAM	A65-25311	2142
128	7590	07/14/2003			_
		<b>ERNATIONAL</b>	EXAMINER		
101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245				NGUYEN, KEVIN M	
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245		07962-2245		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2674	1
			•	DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003	, (

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pu

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/460,197	CUNNINGHAM ET AL.				
w	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin M. Nguyen	2674				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension				
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	originally set in the final Office action; or				
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI</li> </ol>	•					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);					
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	, ,					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		•				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	reconsideration has been consi e Continuation Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>33-36,38-46 and 48-52</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on 07 July 2	003 is a)⊠ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449)/Paper No(s)	·				
10. Other:		Kevin M. Nguyen				
	RICHARD HJERPE SUPERVISORY PATENT FXAMINER	Examiner				





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Stoddard et al teach driving a plurality of displays of different types with communication buses or data flow paths are illustrated as singles lines (see column 2, lines 42-43).